



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,942	06/08/2001	Charles A. Porter	PU010084	9076
25096	7590	01/11/2006	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP PATENT-SEA P.O. BOX 1247 SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/876,942

Applicant(s)

PORTER ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final Rejection in response to amendments filed on 10/19/05.
2. Claims 4, and 17 are cancelled by applicant, and claims 1-3,5-16,18-21 are pending in this action.
3. The Examiner withdraws the 35 USC 101 rejection since the Applicant amended to include a computer hardware structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2-1) Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs (US 6225995, filed Oct 21, 1997), in view of Eyal (US 6389467, filed May 2, 2000, as cited in an IDS), further in view of Call (US 6418441, filed Jul 2000).

Regarding claim 1, Jacobs teaches “analyzing each field ... each field,” and “adding ... metadata” (ie., URI ... identify the metadata associated with browser request ... send a revised browser message)(col 21, line 40 – col 22, line 15; Summary; col 2, line 65 – col 3, line 20).

Jacobs does not expressly teach “streaming” but Eyal does teach streaming media playback on a network (col 5, lines 60-65) and metadata extraction module

accesses for each link to extract metadata about the identified media link (col 6, lines 3-10).

Jacobs in view of Eyal does not expressly teach the amendments to claim 1, but Call does suggest the claim limitations with the amendments (ie., in a method for disseminating information via the internet, using universal product codes, with a URL table allowing a web search engine can perform web crawler indexing of the websites specified by the listed IP address (which the examiner as equivalent to URI based on the applicant's specs), thereby generating an index to items in the table; Examiner interprets the customer and product information as metadata)(col 9, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include streaming media playback on a network where the metadata extraction module accesses for each link to extract metadata about the identified media link as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of providing streaming media on the internet reliably when the number of users accessing the site become congested (col 2, lines 15-48), further to include placing IP address in an indexable database table such that can be searched by a web crawler as taught by Call, providing the benefit of a method for transferring request for specific information to preferred sources of the information on the Internet (col 1, lines 3-35).

Regarding claim 2, Jacobs does not teach, but Eyal teaches "reorganizing said plurality ... reorganized plurality of fields" (ie., organize media clips according to an order ... listed together or listed before less preferred clip ...)(col 29, lines 40-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include organizing media clips as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of accessing streaming media on the Internet where users search for selected media creations and results are outputted to the user as a display of links (Eyal, col 1, lines 15-47).

Regarding claim 5, 18, Jacobs does not expressly teach, but Eyal teaches “analyzing each field ... identified for a field” (ie., determine if structure is empty. Continue parsing until empty)(col 22, lines 18-66).

Eyal teaches “adding said associated metadata ... been identified” (ie., updating the rating field for the media recording)(col 30, lines 52-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include continuing parsing until the structure is empty and updating the rating field for media as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of accessing streaming media on the Internet where users search for selected media creations and results are outputted to the user as a display of links (Eyal, col 1, lines 15-47).

Regarding claim 6, 19, Jacobs teaches “adding a contents ... metadata” (ie., server initiates an operation to incorporate information to the URL)(col 2, line 55 – col 3, line 20).

Regarding claim 7, 12, 14, 20, Jacobs teaches “replacing ... terms ... original metadata” (ie., server extracts information from the URL and uploads information into a URL)(col 3, lines 5-22).

Jacobs in view of Eyal does not expressly teach the amendments, but Call does suggest the claim limitations with the amendments (ie., in a method for disseminating information via the internet, using universal product codes, with a URL table allowing a web search engine can perform web crawler indexing of the websites specified by the listed IP address (which the examiner as equivalent to URI based on the applicant's specs), thereby generating an index to items in the table in a *database*; Examiner interprets the customer and product information as metadata)(col 9, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include streaming media playback on a network where the metadata extraction module accesses for each link to extract metadata about the identified media link as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of providing streaming media on the internet reliably when the number of users accessing the site become congested (col 2, lines 15-48), further to include placing IP address in an indexable database table such that can be searched by a web crawler as taught by Call, providing the benefit of a method for transferring request for specific information to preferred sources of the information on the Internet (col 1, lines 3-35).

Regarding claim 8, 21, Jacobs does not teach, but Eyal teaches "elements related to at least one of content of the media" (ie., media from the network)(col 1, lines 50-67; summary).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include media from the network as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of accessing streaming media on the Internet where users search

for selected media creations and results are outputted to the user as a display of links (Eyal, col 1, lines 15-47).

Regarding claim 9, Jacobs does not teach but Eyal teaches “media comprises multimedia” (ie., multimedia)(col 13, line 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include multimedia as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of accessing streaming media on the Internet where users search for selected media creations and results are outputted to the user as a display of links (Eyal, col 1, lines 15-47).

Regarding claims 11, 13, 15, Jacobs does not teach, but Eyal teaches ... *reorganizing said plurality of fields* (ie., organize media clips according to an order ... listed together or listed before less preferred clip ...)(col 29, lines 40-57). Jacobs teaches *URI* and *original metadata* (ie., URI)(Jacobs, col 21, lines 40-45).

Jacobs teaches *analyzing each field ... each field and adding ... metadata* (ie., URI ... identify the metadata associated with browser request ... send a revised browser message)(col 21, line 40 – col 22, line 15; Summary; col 2, line 65 – col 3, line 20).

Jacobs does not expressly teach “streaming” but Eyal does teach streaming media playback on a network (col 5, lines 60-65) and metadata extraction module accesses for each link to extract metadata about the identified media link (col 6, lines 3-10).

Jacobs in view of Eyal does not expressly teach the amendments, but Call does suggest the claim limitations with the amendments (ie., in a method for disseminating information via the internet, using universal product codes, with a URL table allowing a web search engine can perform web crawler indexing of the websites specified by the listed IP address (which the examiner as equivalent to URI based on the applicant's specs), thereby generating an index to items in the table; Examiner interprets the customer and product information as metadata)(col 9, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs to include organizing media clips as taught by Eyal, providing the benefit of accessing streaming media on the Internet where users search for selected media creations and results are outputted to the user as a display of links (Eyal, col 1, lines 15-47) , further to include placing IP address in an indexable database table such that can be searched by a web crawler as taught by Call, providing the benefit of a method for transferring request for specific information to preferred sources of the information on the Internet (col 1, lines 3-35).

2-2) Claims 3, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs (as cited above), in view of Eyal (as cited above) and Call (as cited above), further in view of Gabriel (US 6584468, filed Sep 29, 2000, Application No 09675594).

Regarding claim 3, 16, Jacobs in view of Eyal and Call does not teach, but Gabriel teaches "reorganizing said ... reverse order" (ie., ranking and selection process could be reversed)(col 6, lines 25-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Jacobs in view of Eyal and Call to include reverse the ranking process as taught by Gabriel, providing the benefit of indexing network information with searches for files of information relevant to people and resources using weighted links (Gabriel, Abstract section).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3,5-16,18-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The thrust of applicant's arguments deal with the amended portions of the claims. To address those limitations, the Examiner introduces the Call reference (see above rejection for details).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C.S

GS

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1/6/2006